

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number:

0700-0563

Case Title:

Cass County PWSD 9

Subject of Report:

Interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on January 4, 2018

Reporting Office:

Kansas City Area Office

Activity Date:

January 4, 2018

Reporting Official and Date:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Special Agent

16-MAR-2018, Signed by: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Approving Official and Date:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Assistant Special Agent in Charge

16-MAR-2018, Approved by: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Assistant Special Agent in Charge

SYNOPSIS

On January 4, 2018, EPA CID Special Agents (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) at his residence in Pleasant Hill, MO. (b) (6), is a member of the Cass County Water Board. He provided information regarding his role on the Board and recent issues with Water District employees.

DETAILS

On January 4, 2018, EPA CID Special Agents (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) at his residence in Pleasant Hill, MO. (b) (6), is a member of the Cass County Water Board. He provided information regarding his role on the Board and recent issues with Water District employees.

SA (b) (6), and SA (b) (6), (b) identified themselves and displayed their credentials. (b) (6), provided the following information:

(b) (6), is retired. He retired from working at [REDACTED] has been on the Water Board for somewhere between [REDACTED]. There are five members on the Board. (b) (6), was asked to be on the Water Board by (b) (6), he was not elected. There can be an election if additional people want to be on the Board. [REDACTED] is the manager of the Water District. The other members of the Board include: (b) [REDACTED], (b) (6), (b) [REDACTED], LNU, and (b) (6), (b) [REDACTED]. The Board does not receive any compensation for their time other than they are fed dinner or lunch during the meetings. The meetings are the last Friday of the month and require the presence of the Board President and at least two other Board members. The Rural Water Association and Missouri DNR oversee the Water District. (b) (6), said that his responsibilities on the Board entail making motions on financial statements, agreeing to the meeting minutes, approving monthly financial reports and approving major expenditures unless they are an emergency. MDNR deals with the Water District Manager. (b) (6), has seen the reporting that is done to MDNR but stated that a lot of it is "greek." He said that he assumes permit exceedances would be brought to MDNR's attention. (b) (6), stated that he is very of ease in mind with what he does at the Water Board.

The district manager is supposed to handle personnel issues at the water district. The Board's function is to only deal with the manager. However, if the Board feels a position is not required, they can eliminate the position. That decision would be made during the budget process. Prior to Board meetings, (b) (6), and (b) (6), LNU drop off the financials from the district office. Water District employees [REDACTED] (b) (6), LNU, and [REDACTED] LNU attend all the Board meetings. The meetings are also open to the public.

(b) (6), has known [REDACTED] for approximately 30 years. (b) [REDACTED] married (b) (6), (b) [REDACTED] aunt. (b) (6), receives a "half beef" from [REDACTED] every two years.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number:

0700-0563

There is one meeting that (b) (6), did not attend, it was a closed meeting. There was a second meeting closed door meeting that (b) (6), (b) was present for. He recalls that the meeting was maybe in June or July. (b) (6), (b) recalls the closed door meeting was something about taking water samples. He believes he first became aware of the issue in July. His understanding is that [REDACTED] was submitting samples but not properly. (b) (6) told (b) (6), about the incident. (b) (6), (b) said that the issue has been corrected. He described it as a "bad deal" and said that it shouldn't have happened that way. The Board's fix was to have a different person take the samples at different locations, [REDACTED] LNU takes them now. Before it came to the Board's attention, [REDACTED] was taking samples at one place. Another issue related to a tablet also came up. The Water District had been paying for a tablet that was being used by (b) (6), family. That expenditure had not been approved so it was dealt with also. (b) (6), punishment was one month without pay.

There is a permit that outlines the sampling method and samples are submitted to MDNR. (b) (6), (b) does not know if [REDACTED] reported the improper sampling to MDNR. He said that it is recorded in the minutes of the Water Board's closed door session.

The Board also heard complaints from (b) (6), employees. The Board does not handle personnel management. The Board gave [REDACTED] until October or November to straighten out the personnel problems. (b) (6), described it as a "he said/she said" and said that he doesn't like that. In November, the Board had another closed door meeting and decided on the one month suspension. The Board also decided that there was no need for four employees and eliminated one position. The Water District employees spoke one at a time stating that [REDACTED] was inaccessible. (b) (6), felt like their statements were rehearsed and that they were all out to get somebody. He said all the allegations made by employees were superficial and could not be proved. For example, there was an allegation that [REDACTED] was buying gas for his personal use. (b) (6), said that they just weren't getting along. [REDACTED] fired a guy three or four years ago and, (b) (6), (b) believes, that it still eats at (b) (6), LNU. (b) (6), (b) believed all three employees were in cahoots to have the Board do something to [REDACTED] (b) (6), said that things seem to have gotten better since that time.

Nothing happened in the finances that caused the Board to eliminate a position, there was just a general consensus that the job could be done with three people instead of four. [REDACTED] was not happy about the one month suspension or about losing one employee. It was decided that the least senior employee would be let go. There is an annual audit of the financials, the audit is done by (b) (6), CPA's in Harrisonville, MO.

(b) (6), (b) believes that someone in the District Office would have made a notification to MDNR on the sampling. It likely would have been (b) (6), responsibility but could have been someone else. The Board has no direct contact with MDNR.